MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
NOVEMBER 15, 1960

The Commission met in executive session, pursuant to notice, at 2:00 p.m. with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley
Douglas W. Orr
Ralph W. Walker
William G. Perry
Michael Rapuano
Felix W. de Weldon

L.R.Wilson, Secretary
Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Sec'y
C.L. Martin, Counsel

1. Administration

a.The members agreed that the next meeting of the Commission would be on December 14, 1960 at 9:30 a.m., with an executive session to be held on December 13, 1960 at 2:00 pm.

The Chairman asked the members to express their opinions on the responsibility of delegating authority to the Secretary to sign letters dealing with technical matters to the various agencies submitting items to the Commission. He explained that he did not feel it was necessary for the Chairman to sign such letters where policy questions were not involved and that he would continue to sign all policy statements as the Chairman of the Commission. After some discussion the members approved a resolution that the Chairman, at his discretion, should delegate his authority to sign such letters.

b. Approval of Minutes

The Secretary announced that the minutes for the September and October meetings had been prepared in draft, but had not yet been completed in final form. The minutes will be mailed to the members approximately one week before the next meeting.

2. Submissions

a. National Capital Planning Commission

(1) Federal Office Buildings in "Metro Center"

Mr. William E. Finley, Director, and Mr. Morton Hoppenfeld, Civic Designer, of the National Capital Planning Commission met with the

members to present the views of the Planning Commission on the question of the future location and character of federal buildings in the area which they designate as "Metro Center", which includes the L'Enfant city, from the Potomac River to the Anacostia River and bounded on the north by Florida Avenue. Two documents entitled "Location of Federal Buildings in Metro-Center, Summary of Consideration" and "Location and Character of Federal Office Areas in Metro-Center," were submitted for consideration by the members. These documents constitute Exhibits A and B to these minutes.

Mr. William Finley began the presentation. He stated that the Planning Commission was faced with the problem of determining both the location and character of future federal office buildings in the city. He stated that in the next 40 years the city of Washington will have an additional 210,000 federal employees, and that the Planning Commission studies indicate that as many as 140 to 150,000 can be located outside the District of Columbia. The problem is thus to provide the facilities for the remaining 50 to 60,000 employees.

Mr. Hoppenfeld stated that future federal buildings could be placed in either of two areas. Under one scheme the East Mall, along East Capital Street, could be developed in the same manner as the existing Mall, west of the Capitol ground, with rows of Federal Office buildings on the north and south side of the Mall. The other scheme is to develop federal employment centers, in and adjacent to the downtown area of the city, such as around the important squares and circles which now exist.

Mr. Hoppenfeld stated the various objections to the first plan, i.e., the geographic factors, the transportation problems, the sense of completeness in design, the effect of large open spaces on facing property, etc., and proceeded to demonstrate by drawings how he would like to see federal employment centers developed under the second plan. Under this plan, individual federal office buildings would be built on the important squares and circles of the city in a less monumental style of architecture in scale than that demanded for large open spaces, in a harmonious relationship between the Federal establishment and the other functions of the city as a whole. He stated that the East Mall should be largely a residential area, with Lincoln Park greatly expanded in size and East Capitol Street made into a boulevard running from the Anacostia River to the Capitol.

Mr. Hoppenfeld also showed the members some preliminary sketches of possible plans for the development of federal employment centers in areas outside of the downtown area of the city. The members discussed this concept at some length and suggested possible alternatives.

The members thought there was some merit in the general conceptions

presented. The Chairman pointed out that the Commission had authorized him to state to a Congressional hearing in 1959, pertaining to the Mass Transportation Act, that it was the Commission's belief that future federal buildings should be built in comployment centers in the downtown area and in other locations along the routes of mass transportation facilities in the District of Columbia. The members also agreed that the linear development of the East Mall as the sites of future federal office buildings was not desirable for the reasons mentioned by Mr. Hoppenfeld.

It was suggested to Mr. Hoppenfeld that the members would like to see in more detail his plan for the development of the area east of the Capitol as a residential and recreational area and hoped that he would return for a further presentation of some of these ideas developed in greater detail. It was also suggested that some federal buildings could be placed on the East Mall as far east as Lincoln Park, but that these buildings ought to be in the nature of the present buildings near the Capitol grounds such as the Folger Library and the Library of Congress, rather than federal office buildings.

(2) Change in the Inner Loop Freeway, 11th Street, S.E.

The Chairman read a draft of a letter to the President of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia stating that the Commission had noted that a proposal had been made by the National Capital Planning Commission that the east leg of the Inner Loop Freeway northward from Virginia Avenue, S.E. be moved one block westward between 10th and 11th Streets, rather than between 11th and 12th Streets as originally proposed. The letter expressed the hope that this suggestion would be approved by the District Commissioners because it would not destroy Lincoln Park and necessitate eliminating the tall trees and relocating the Emancipation Monument. It was suggested that the Commission recommend that the profile of the freeway should be low enough to provide for any future extension of Lincoln Park. The Commission approved the draft. EXHIBIT C

(3) Land Acquisition

The Secretary informed the members that the National Capital Planning Commission had approved the acquisition of Lots 800, 807 and part of Lot 808 in Square 10 in Northwest Washington for the relocation of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. The members approved the acquisition of these tracts.

b. Department of the Army
Heraldic Branch, Office of the Quartermaster General
(1) Four Chaplain's Medal, Revised Design
The Secretary informed the members that the revised design

for the Four Chaplains Medal, incorporating the recommendations made at the October meeting of the Commission, had not arrived. Consequently, no action was taken on this item on the agenda.

(2) National Cultural Center Seal

The members looked at drawings of a proposed design for a National Cultural Center Seal submitted by the Heraldic Branch of the Office of the Quartermaster General.

After studying the drawings the members concluded that the design as presented could not be approved since it lacked any real sense of emotional appeal. It was recommended that the design of the seal should be referred to Mr. Edward D. Stone, the architect of the Center. The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT D

c. Department of the Navy
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Relocation of Statue of Dr. Benjamin Rush

The Commission considered a request from the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Department of the Navy, for approval of a proposal to move the statue of Dr. Benjamin Rush from its present location in front of the old Naval Observatory on the axis of 26th Street, N.W. to a site on the grounds of St. Elizabeth's Hospital. The relocation is said to be necessitated by the building of the E Street Freeway.

After considering the problem, the members recommended that the statue be allowed to remain where it is for the present, and that when it is moved it should be to a location in the city of Washington, such as in one of the smaller parks near the Archives Building. The Secretary was directed to write a letter setting forth the Commission's recommendation. EXHIBIT E

3. Review

a. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads
Plaque for Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge

The Secretary showed the members a photograph of one of the aluminum castings of the plaques of Woodrow Wilson to be placed on the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge. The Commission had approved the design of the plaque at its March 14, 1960 meeting. No action taken.

b. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Building

The members discussed the final revised plans for the Federal

Deposit Insurance Corporation Building at 17th Street and NewYork Avenue, Northwest. The members were of the opinion that the design of the building had been greatly improved over the design which had originally been submitted. However, they believed that the building should never have been placed on the site. The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter to the Administrator of the General Services Administration expressing the views of the Commission. EXHIBIT F

4. Discussion

a. Letter to the President Concerning the Great Plaza and Removal of Temporary Buildings

The Chairman read a draft of a proposed letter to the President from the Commission of Fine Arts expressing the members' appreciation for his efforts to preserve and enhance the beauty of the city of Washington, and suggesting two improvements which the Commission hoped would be started during his administration. The suggested projects were the removal of commercial parking lot from the Great Plaza on 14th Street, Northwest, between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues, and the removal of the temporary building on the west side of the Monument grounds. The members approved the draft as presented. EXHIBIT G

b. Meeting of the Joint Executive Committee of the American Planning and Civic Association

The Chairman told the members of a meeting of the Joint Executive Committee of the American Planning and Civic Association in Washington on November 17, 1960, which he planned to attend. He also submitted for consideration prepared statements on ten projects which he wished to present to the meeting as the views of the Commission. THe members concurred in the prepared statements, which are appended to these minutes as EXHIBIT H

c. Temporary Shelter on the Front of Union Station

The members considered a proposal to write the management of the Union Station and ask if any consideration had been given to the removal and replacement of the temporary wooden shelter in front of the station with a more attractive canopy in view of the forthcoming removal of the streetcar tracks from the front of the station. The members agreed that the wooden shelter was unattractive, but it was concluded that the Commission should not act on the matter at the present time.

d. Veterans Administration
Parking for the New Veterans Administration Hospital

The Chairman told the members of a telephone conversation with a member of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget, in which he was informed that no money would be available for the construction of an underground or other parking facility for the new Veterans Administration Hospital to be built in the District of Columbia. It was explained that the contractors' bids had absorbed any surplus over the estimated cost of the construction which might have been used for a parking facility.

The members discussed the problem and concluded that the Commission should write a letter to the Bureau of the Budget expressing the hope that in the future the Veterans Administration would be allowed to present an alternate proposal that if the estimated cost of the building is more than the low bid, the surplus could be used to cover the cost of underground or separate parking facilities.

e. National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc.
Plans for Meeting with Commission of Fine Arts

The Chairman informed the members that the Executive Director of the National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc. had invited the members of the staff of the Commission to meet with representatives of the Downtown Committee preliminary to presentation of plans for downtown Washington at the December meeting by the Committee.

6. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. Report of Actions Taken on Shipstead-Luce Applications dated 15 November 1960 (Appendix 1)

The Secretary reported the actions taken, after recommendations of the Shipstead-Luce Panel of Architects, on the Shipstead-Luce Applications forwarded for review by the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections since 18 October 1960. This report was dated 15 November 1960 and comprised Appendix 1 of the Order of Business. After noting the individual cases, the favorable actions as shown on Appendix 1 were confirmed by the members. Confirmation of unfavorable action and recommendations for changes were given in each instance, in the following cases which had been disapproved by the Shipstead-Luce Panel and held for review by the Commission:

| | |
|---|---|
| S.L. 2337 | 943 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.<br>Penn Camera Exchange |
| S.L. 2341 | 5830 Oregon Avenue, N.W.<br>Maurice Stearman |
| S.L. 2343 | 5810 Oregon Avenue, N.W.<br>Abraham J. Kaplowitz |

7. Old Georgetown Act

Report of Actions Taken on Old Georgetown Applications since 9 November 1960 (Report dated 15 November 1960)

The Secretary reported on the actions taken, after recommendations of the Georgetown Panel of Architects, on the Old Georgetown Applications forwarded for review by the Districtof Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections, since 9 November 1960. This report was dated 15 November 1960 and comprises Appendix 2 of the Order of Business. After noting the individual cases the favorable actions as shown on Appendix 2 were confirmed by the members. Confirmation was given to the unfavorable action and recommendation in the case of OG 2724, 1001-19 30th Street, N.W., William T. Galliher & Bros., which had been disapproved by the Georgetown Panel and held for review by the Commission.

At 6:00 p.m. the meeting was recessed until the following morning at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C.L. Martin

C.L. Martin
Counsel

Approved:

L.R. Wilson
Secretary

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
NOVEMBER 15, 1960

ORDER OF BUSINESS

2:00 p.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. ADMINISTRATION

a. Date of Next Meeting: 14 December 1960

Executive Session: 13 December 1960

b. Approval of Minutes - Discussion

3. SUBMISSIONS

2:30 p.m. a. National Capital Planning Commission

(1) Federal Office Buildings in "Metro Center" (Mr. Hoppenfeld)

Draft app with [illegible] on Pole

X (2) Change in Inner Loop Freeway, 11th Street, S.E.

X (3) Land Acquisition, Confirmation app

b. Department of the Army, Heraldic Branch, Office of the Quartermaster General

(1) Four Chaplains Medal, Revised Design dwgs not arrived. Refer to archit

(2) National Cultural Center Seal [illegible]

c. Department of the Navy, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery

Statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush, Relocation Not app.

4. REVIEW

a Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads

Plaque for Woodrow Wilson Bridge Not ncc

b. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Building Write letter

5. DISCUSSION

a. Commission of Fine Arts letter to President about Great Plaza and Tempos Draft [illegible] on the National Capital,

b. Meeting of Joint Executive Committee, American Planning and Civic Association

5. DISCUSSION (Continued)

c. Commission of Fine Arts letter reference Shelter on front of Union Station drop fr minute

d. Veterans Administration - Parking for new Veterans Administration Hospital write letter B.B.

e. National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc., Plans for meeting with Commission of Fine Arts Draft app.

6. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

a. Report of Actions Taken on Shipstead-Luce Act Applications, dated 11/15/60 (Appendix 1)

b. Informal Revision to SL 2234 for sign at 934 D Street, N.W. (Porter and Brady, Signs)

7. OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

a. Report of Actions taken on Old Georgetown Act Applications dated 11/15/60 (Appendix 2)

b. Information: Hearing at District Building re razing dwelling at 1046 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. (OG 2699)

c. Information: Letter dated 11/7/60 to D.C. Engineer Commissioner re non-compliance with CFA recommendations on O.G. 2654)

Item 3 a (1)

LOCATION OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS IN METRO-CENTER:

Summary of Considerations

November 3, 1960

NATIONAL CAPITAL 2000 a.d.

PLANNING COMMISSION
REGIONAL COUNCIL

## The East Mall

### Positive aspects.

1. Relatively low acquisition costs

2. Accessibility by automobile -- area is intersected by a portion of the Inner Loop, and is less congested than more central locations

3. Serviceability by the mass transit system replanned -- area is linear in form and can therefore be serviced by one mass transit line throughout its extent

4. It can be said to be an extension of existing monumental concepts

5. Current status as a policy of the National Capital Planning Commission and others

6. Might possibly counteract northwestward movement of the central business area

7. Might possibly stimulate private redevelopment of housing and Federal-related non-residential functions

8. Would spread out Metro-Center destinations on the transit system, possibly reducing congestion at some points, although most passengers would have to pass on through the heart of the city

### Negative aspects.

1. Possibly higher development costs for low-density buildings and underground parking.

EXHIBIT A

2. Probable use of auto as access mode would tend to add congestion to highway system

3. Distance from the central shopping and service area might affect employee morale and cause recruiting problems

4. Distance from central private offices and other central Federal offices might cause losses in time and efficiency where relationships with these other facilities are concerned

5. Its validity as an extension of the Mall is somewhat doubtful, since the topography is unsuitable for a mall, and the form and facilities included in the East Mall would be unlike those of the existing Mall

6. It could have adverse effects on adjacent residential areas, both from traffic and from the types of commercial development that would be generated

7. Sense of "incompleteness" until full development

## The Downtown Sites

### Positive aspects.

1. Possibly lower unit development costs for high-density type buildings

2. Accessibility to downtown shopping and service areas

3. Accessibility to other centrally located Federal facilities

4. Might have the effect of attracting private offices in the central business area back to the east and counteract the current northwestward movement of these offices

5. Would make it possible to eliminate transitional areas on the fringes of the central business area by locating Federal offices in these "soft" area

6. Would tend to increase the number of Metro-Center workers using mass transit facilities by placing Federal employment at or near the confluence of transit lines and in an area not particularly accessible to automobiles

7. Could make possible strong visual relationships between present and future Federal buildings and Federal and private facilities

8. Federal buildings could in several ways be used to guide private CBA development, give form to the central business area, and provide open spaces in congested areas

9. Federal buildings could be used to give the proper form and setting to the many important diagonal streets and open spaces located on the fringes of the central business area

10. Cellular concept of growth gives "completed" appearance at all stages of development.

Negative aspects.

1. Could not be serviced to any great degree by automobile

2. Relatively higher acquisition costs

3. Office complexes might act as a "wall" between close-in residential areas and the central retail core

4. Requires highest level of design skills.

Item 3 a(1)

LOCATION AND CHARACTER OF FEDERAL OFFICE AREAS IN METRO-CENTER

November 4, 1960

NATIONAL CAPITAL 2000 a.d.

PLANNING COMMISSION
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Current estimates of Federal employment in the National Capital place the Regional total at about 230,000 and that of Metro-Center at about 170,000. The "best" estimate of the Regional employment in the year 2000 is 450,000. The question of the number of Federal employees to be accommodated in Metro-Center in the future must ultimately be a matter of public policy, whether this policy is consciously organized or not. Conscious organization of Federal employment policy is necessary, however, if plans for orderly growth of the region are to succeed in any measure.

Current programs for the construction of Federal and other public office buildings will provide space for an estimated 170,000 employees after demolition of temporary office buildings. The different land-use patterns which are being considered as theoretical alternatives for the total Region indicate Federal employments in Metro-Center ranging from 180,000 to 265,000. Since a substantial proportion (possibly up to 10%) of Federal employment can be expected to be located in private leased space, the programmed developments can accommodate all of the employment at the lowest estimate. However, the more centralized regional schemes would involve an increment of as many as 75,000 employees for which space cannot be provided in currently programmed structures.

One of the major questions to be answered in the planning of Metro-Center is that of the location of new Federal employment, and this question has been narrowed down by staff investigation to a consideration of two general locations: (1) a basically linear conception, with most of the new employment in the area which has been termed the "East Mall", and (2) a more centralized pattern, with new Federal offices in and adjacent to the central business area. These two location concepts imply to some extent principles of individual-structure and structure-complex design; although the scale and style of individual structures and complexes could vary considerably given

EXHIBIT B

one concept or the other, the East Mall would seem to call for a somewhat more monumental type of design than the Central location. This aspect will be discussed in more detail later.

Comparisons of these two location concepts can be made in terms of three general aspects: (1) cost, (2) access, and (3) amenity and "image".

1. Cost.

Acquisition costs for the Central locations would certainly be higher than for locations in the East Mall. A preliminary investigation of assessed valuations indicates that costs per square foot for Central locations would run slightly over three times those for the linear scheme. This figure will be modified by the fact that Federal offices in areas near the central business area would be built at considerably higher densities than those in an East Mall in keeping with the general scale of this part of Metro-Center; a 60% increase in employee density in the Central location (for instance, an increase from the present Floor Area Ratio of less than 2.5 to one nearer 4.0) would reduce the relative cost per employee housed to only twice that of the East Mall. It is also possible that the higher density building types will have a lower cost per unit of floor space.

Further study of the cost situation must be made before anything approaching a complete view of it can be had; the relative costs of many tangible and intangible factors in the two areas should be investigated. Some aspects to be considered might be the cost of services (including transportation), costs of employee recruitment, costs of building construction, economic impact on surrounding areas, and any others which might vary from one location to the other.

2. Access.

In general, it would seem that a linear Federal office pattern can be efficiently served by a high-capacity transportation system (such as a subway) which throughout most of its extent is linear in form than would be the case for the Central scheme. The East Mall could be very effectively served by a subway system running along its east-west axis, and this route could probably be incorporated rather easily into the Regional system; however, it is not now presently planned for. At best, this scheme would only be serviced by a single line of the transit system. Automobile and bus

access would probably be more easily handled for the East Mall, also, because it is in an otherwise comparatively uncongested area, and it is bisected by a portion of the Inner Loop freeway; this would tend to require extensive parking facilities.

The Central locations which have been suggested would be almost wholly dependent on service by mass transit facilities, and it is perfectly conceivable that a system could be worked out which would provide even more effective service than the East Mall since the Central location is closer to the crossing of two lines, vs. the single line service of the Mall. The basic problem here is that the Central scheme has the effect of extending the congested portion of the central area in a non-linear manner. However, it is expected that by the year 2000 there will be three subway lines (six individual radials) which could be arranged at their convergence in the central area to serve a large non-linear development, thus supporting a high density core area. The local bus system could presumably be designed to supplement the interurban systems in servicing a centralized and relatively large CBA. Automobile access for the Central Federal-office locations would also be most difficult to handle because of the size and extent of the employment area created by locating Federal offices close to the remainder of the CBA employment area and would be almost completely discouraged.

3. Amenity

Questions of amenity, "image," perceptual effects, symbolism, and other similarly intangible aspects of Federal-office location are of far more importance in the Federal City than they would be in other areas.

The East Mall has been thought of as an extension of the monumental concept of Federal-office design which seems to have been the policy of agencies concerned with the construction of Federal buildings up to the present time. It provides a continuation of the East-West axis of the present Mall, and would provide sites for very large buildings of a generally extra-human scale, similar to the existing buildings and those underway. This concept has considerable merit; the popular conception of public buildings has been in these terms: the monumental building is generally identifiable as a government building (although countless other nongovernmental institutions have mimed this form) and one presumed that a certain awe and respect is created for these structures and the institutions they stand for. The negative aspect of this concept is that it is possibly too awe-inspiring, that outside of working hours

these government buildings are dead and useless as parts of the city. The effect of a large development of this sort extending into the large residential areas of the Southeast and Northeast could be a very questionable one. A shortcoming of the "Mall" design is the "unfinished" look at all except the final stage of development.

The effects of the East Mall development would not only be visual. The traffic and crowds generated by the large numbers of employees located in the area might contribute to the physical and social deterioration of surrounding residential areas. Another possible disadvantage of the East Mall as a Federal employment area is that it is a comparatively long distance from the central business area and from other Federal buildings. Although the extent and nature of physical interaction between the agencies which might be located in this area and those more centrally located is currently in question, it seems probable that its distance from related Federal facilities and from noontime and after-hours shopping and other in-city activities and the general sense of downtown could result in considerable loss of work time and employee morale. Finally, the East Mall as a monumental concept is somewhat doubtful; the convex topography of the area precludes views from one end to the other, and there seems no reason to believe that the East Mall is a consistent extension of the present Mall, which it would resemble neither in form (except to the extent that it is linear) or in the nature of the facilities included in it. It might even result in a dilution of the effect of existing monumental areas, the image of which is grand and firmly implanted in minds throughout the world. Possibly the greatest single question regarding this location is the degree to which it continues and fosters a basic dicotomy between the concept of a great "Federal city" vs. a "city and the Federal complex."

The proposed Federal locations around the central business area represent a fairly radical change in current attitudes toward public office complexes, those perhaps based on the stereotype massive public building. The concept of CBA locations has indicated that the design and scale of Federal office structures should be more in keeping with the urban scale of the city. The buildings would be smaller in perimeter, possibly higher, but would create small usable outdoor spaces at pedestrian scale. The large Federal-office complexes would be avoided in these locations. The individual Federal structures would require the best contemporary design to give them the sense of presence,

dignity and repose necessary to set them apart from the background buildings of the rest of the city. The visual identity of these structures as Federal buildings which has previously been provided by neo-classical styles would result from superior design and the handling of building masses and open spaces.

The major value of the Central concept of Federal-office location is probably its perceptual image. The Federal area would be continuous, but would not be so extensive as to overwhelm the other elements of the central city; because buildings would be integrated with neighboring private development, because they would be of a more nearly human scale, and because of a more utilitarian and "urban" treatment of related open spaces, Federal areas would be expected to be used more in off hours and consequently to have less of their present deadening effect. These Central locations are close enough to other Federal areas and to central commercial areas to provide visual relationships which would not be possible in the East Mall locations.

A further advantage of Central Federal locations would be the good physical access provided between them and other central area facilities, such as the central shopping area, private office areas, and other Federal offices. Many doubts have been expressed about the theory that Federal offices can provide a substantial addition to normal downtown retail sales through noontime and after-hours shopping by Federal employees, but it would seem that the converse effect is of considerable importance to Federal employee morale: a work place near the downtown shopping area is a strong attraction to some employee groups.

Federal buildings are conceived of as one of the most important form givers in Metro-Center, and it is felt that this quality can be used to a maximum in CBA locations. The CBA fringe is a major problem because of its deteriorating character; the proposed Federal complexes could be used to replace these deteriorating areas and to provide a distinct and controllable limitation on the expansion of the business district, possibly providing a desirable alternative to the "inevitable" transitional business fringe. As Federal buildings, certain design opportunities are inherent and would allow the improvement of squares and vistas as part of the L'Enfant plan but never developed as such.

A final value of this alternative lies in its basic cellular nature, that is, the design concept is such that it can grow in steps and in various directions in relationship to existing centers. As such, it will always seem "complete" at any stage in the 40-year building program.

22 November 1960

Dear Mr. President:

The Commission of Fine Arts has noted that a public hearing was held on November 8, 1960 by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia concerning plans for the completion of the Inner Loop Freeway northward from Virginia Avenue, S.E. between 11th and 12th Streets. The proposed scheme would require the reconstruction of more than a third of Lincoln Park over the new Freeway.

We understand that the National Capital Planning Commission has now proposed that the East Leg be located one block westward, that is, between 10th and 11th Street where the plans would not disturb Lincoln Park. Such a location would protect Lincoln Park, prevent destruction of the tall trees and relocation of the Emancipation Monument now standing there. The height of the Freeway should be lowered sufficiently to provide for any future extention of Lincoln Park.

The Commission hopes that the proposal by the National Capital Planning Commission for relocating the Freeway at Lincoln Park will receive the approval of the District Government.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Robert McLaughlin
President, Board of Commissioners for
the District of Columbia
District Building
Washington 4, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

22 November 1960

Dear General Calloway:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on November 15, considered the revised design for a seal for the use of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center.

The members noted the changes that were made after review of the previous design, but they agreed that the design lacked the interest and appeal needed for the work of the National Cultural Center Board. The members further considered that such a design will probably be used in connection with the decoration of the building, in which case the architect of the building, Mr. Edward D. Stone, should be asked for his views and suggestions before a final decision is made.

As a member of the Cultural Center Board, I arranged with the Secretary of the Board, Mr. J. A. Kieffer, to ask Mr. Stone's assistance and I am returning the drawing herewith so that you may forward it to him.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Maj. Gen. C. G. Calloway
Director of Operations
Department of the Army
Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington 25, D. C.

lrw/b

cc- Mr. J. A. Kieffer
Secretary, Cultural Center Board
Rm 5237 North Building
Department of Health, Education & Welfare

EXHIBIT D

30 November 1960

Dear Admiral Kenney:

I have your letter of November 28, notifying us of the concurrence of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in your proposal to relocate the statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush at St. Elizabeth's Hospital. I will inform the members of the Commission immediately of this fact.

Doctor Stone and I have discussed this matter over the telephone, and I have told him of the Commission's desire to know where the responsibility for maintaining the statue lies before coming to a decision. I hope the matter can be concluded by the time of the Commission's meeting in December.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Rear Admiral R.C. Kenney
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Department of the Navy
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

22 November 1960

Dear Mr. Fleets:

At its meeting of November 15, 1960 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the revised elevations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Building at 17th and New York Avenue, N.W., which were forwarded by the Public Buildings Service to the Commission on November 14 for the Commission's files as a matter of record.

It was noted that the drawings incorporated revisions suggested by the members of the Commission of Fine Arts at the September 20, 1960 meeting. After studying the drawings, the members agreed that most of their objections to the design, which was submitted to the Commission first in January of this year, had been met. Although the design was then approved as submitted, the members felt it their duty to express their reluctance to see a building of this type erected on such a prominent and important location in the plan of Washington immediately adjacent to the Executive Offices of the President. The projected building is a departure from the design standards that other quasi-governmental agencies have been willing to adopt for their buildings facing the Ellipse on 17th Street and on Constitution Avenue. We believe the officials of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should have selected some other location, if they were unwilling to make the design of their building conform to those of other semi-governmental agencies in this area.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Franklin Floete
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

16 November 1960

Dear Mr. President:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts which was held on November 15, the members asked me to express to you their deep appreciation of the efforts which you have made during your terms of office as President, to preserve and enhance the beauty of the city of Washington as the nation's capital. They are particularly conscious of your recent efforts to guide the development of the area bordering Lafayette Square and the White House. We hope to carry out your recommendations in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Two other areas remain whose improvement we would hope could be started during your administration. One is the Great Plaza on 14th Street in an important location between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues. This plaza, which is surrounded by the handsome government buildings of the Federal Triangle, was intended to be a park but is now, after thirty years, in use as a commercial parking lot, leased by the General Services Administration to a parking agency in Washington. It contains a fountain to the memory of the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Oscar Straus, but is otherwise unimproved. It is on the ceremonial route by which distinguished foreign visitors to Washington pass on the way to the White House from the airport. The lease above referred to can be terminated, we understand, on short notice by the Administrator of General Services, and the park can be assigned to the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior for development at comparatively small expense.

The other project which we would hope could be accomplished during your administration is the removal of the temporary building, erected during World War II, on the west side of the Washington Monument grounds, obstructing the view from the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. While plans have been made for the removal of all temporary war-time buildings by 1964, it is hoped that this particular building could be demolished sooner so that the Mall can be restored to its former beauty.

The members of the Commission asked me to express, on their behalf as well as my own, our deep appreciation for the honor which you have conferred upon us, in appointing us to the Commission of Fine Arts, and

EXHIBIT G

the pleasure it has been to serve under your distinguished leadership. I wish to add my own personal gratitude for the many kindnesses you have shown me.

Faithfully yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

The President
The White House

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10/18/60 (Continued) 11/15/60

| NO | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| 2342 | 1701 Penna. Ave., NW<br>Internat'l. Bank of Wash. | Rev. to SL 2336 to incorporate suggestions made by the Comm. of Fine Arts on SL 2336. |

ACTION: App'd., provided a darker shade of Tennessee Marble, or other stone is used with the Antique Gold Aluminum No. 6120. Request sample, 11/15/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2343 | 5810 Oregon Ave., NW<br>Abraham J. Kaplowitz | New 1-story & basement, brick & frame dwelling. |

ACTION: Disap'd. Exterior elevations are complicated through use of too many dissimilar elements. Recommend restudy, reducing the number of exterior materials, and the variety in size & shape of wall openings; also, correct discrepancies in height of eave line between what is shown on right & rear elevation drawings, 11/15/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2344 | 7-9-11-13 2nd St., NE<br>John Marshall Apts.<br>(Mrs. L.B. Silverman) | Renovate interior & exterior of exist. row houses to efficiency units. 3-story addn. on rear. |

ACTION: Ret'd. for additional inf. There seems to be discrepancies between the plans & elevations at main entr. & adjacent dressing rm. window, 11/15/60.

Exhibit 7

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10/18/60 11/15/60

| NO | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| 2337 | 943 Penna. Ave., NW<br>Penn Camera Exchange, Inc. | Install black canvas awning over showwindow & entr. door; roll-up style. |

ACTION: Disapp'd. Projecting canopy was added to original design to provide shade for windows & makes attachment of awning to it, as shown on sketch, impossible. Recommend elimination of canopy for installation of awning; or incorporation of awning into it, without exposed bracing or tie rods, 11/15/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2338 | 2248 Cathedral Ave., NW<br>George Jones | Replace exist. wood front porch, roof, deck & steps with concrete deck & steps with iron rail. |

ACTION: App'd., provided following changes are made: (1) Bottom of 2nd-story window, over entrance, be bricked up so window will be same size as other windows; (2) Areas of brickwork, exposed by removal of porch, be neatly treated to harmonize with rest of brickwork; (3) Concrete steps be faced with brick, 11/10/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2339 | 2250 Cathedral Ave., NW<br>Ruth Allison | Same as SL 2338. |

ACTION: Same as SL 2338.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2340 | 2101 Const. Ave., NW<br>Nat'l. Academy of Sciences | Rev. to SL 2237. Grass terrace to carry on line of marble terrace on west side of new wing of bldg. |

ACTION: App'd., as revised in drawings dtd. 11/1/60, for changes in design of terrace, 11/8/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2341 | 5830 Oregon Ave., NW<br>Maurice Stearman | 1-story & basement brick dwelling & driveway. |

ACTION: Disap'd. Recom. for front entranceway the use of wrought iron railing in place of pipe rail; facing concrete steps & slab with brick; restudy of eave details over doorway; & submission of revised drawings showing changes to front & left elevations sketched on the prints, 11/15/60.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 11/9/60 11/15/60

| NO | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| 2722 | 2820 "O" St., NW<br>Lawrence E. Filson | Replace wood steps & entr. porch with wood balcony; balcony to extend 27" beyond bldg. line. |

ACTION: Recom'd. for parts visible from a public highway, provided that the 2 end sections of balcony railing are same dimension, leaving smaller central panel, 11/1/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2723 | 1535-34th St., NW<br>Jos. E. Keller | Rev. to OG 2698 & OG 2688 for add'ns. & renovation to exist. dwelling (This is an application for changes made in plans by owner since plans were approved). |

ACTION: Recom'd., provided following changes are made: (1) Eliminate exposed flue lining of chimney; (2) Install panels in bottom of French doors on east side elevation; (3) Omit horizontal muntin in kitchen window; (4) Vertical dimensions of lights in all windows to be not less than 2" greater than horizontal dimensions; (5) Raise pitch of dormer roofs & decrease width of jambs, 11/8/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2724 | 1001-19 30th St., NW<br>W.T. Galliher & Bros. (Lumber) | 7' chain-link fence. |

ACTION: Not recommended, for chain-link fence; recommend wood fence, 11/15/60.

Exhibit I

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10/18/60 NOV 9 1960

| NO | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| 2709 | 3539 R St., NW<br>W. & J. Zajaczkowski | 6' cedar picket fence, with cedar picket gate. |
| ACTION: | Recommended for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60. | |
| 2710 | 2620 P St., NW<br>J. F. Harris, III | 5' wrought-iron fence & gate.<br>4 brick column pillars. |
| ACTION: | Recommended for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60. | |
| 2711 | 3244 Q St., NW<br>Joan & George Worden | Install bracket light at entrance. |
| ACTION: | Recommended, 10/27/60 | |
| 2712 | 1624 Wisc. Ave., NW<br>Macripodaris Gourmetisserie (Caterer) | 1 green canvas awning over entrance. with fixed iron frames. |
| ACTION: | Not recommended: Recommend shed type canvas awning, 10/27/60. | |
| 2713 | 2904 M St., NW<br>Rosalie Yonan (Office) | Brick addition to existing building. |
| ACTION: | Recom'd. provided entrance from "M" Street is recessed not less than 3', 10/27/60 | |
| 2714 | 1218-29th St., NW<br>Mr & Mrs J.L. LaPrade | Change 1 over 1 sashes to 6 over 6 sashes. Some have already been changed. Change 1 over 1 sash in 5 windows on sides of bays to 4 over 4. |
| ACTION: | Recommended for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60. | |
| 2715 | 1509-28th St., NW<br>John R. Wagley | Enlarge rear window from 1 double-hung to triple casement; replace shutters on all other windows in rear; move rear wood steps to side. |
| ACTION: | Recom'd. for parts visible from a public highway. It does not appear that the proposed alterations to the rear facade of this house will affect any Federal period bldgs., & it is believed that a departure from the general rule of not recommending casement windows in Georgetown is justified in this case, 11/1/60. | |

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 10/18/60 (Continued) NOV 9 1960

| NO | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| 2716 | 2807-09 M St., NW<br>G. Trakas & G. Parris (Restaurant & Beauty Shop) | Revision to OG 2702 to remodel front. |

ACTION: Recom'd. provided that shop window and door sash be 3 lights high & that a panel be included at the bottom of both doors, also width of muntins in shop windows and doors not to exceed 3/4" in width, 10/27/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2717 | 1415-34th St., NW<br>Mr Stacy Lloyd, III | Alterations & add'ns. to residence; brick ret. wall; bay window; & rebuild existing shed. |

ACTION: Recommended for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2718 | 3068 M St., NW<br>Georgetown Redevel. Corp. | Remove exist. showwindows & replace front wall with brick (1st story); replace tin roof, repair or replace woodwork. |

ACTION: Recommended as revised for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2719 | 3410 Q St., NW<br>Mr & Mrs R. H. Davis | New 2-story brick addn. to residence; also new terrace. |

ACTION: Recommended as revised for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2720 | 1800 Wisc. Ave., NW<br>H.A. Gill & Son (Office) | Revision to OG 2704 for 1-story brick veneer, addition & basement, rear. |

ACTION: Recommended provided a 9-light door with 2 solid panels at the bottom be used instead of the French door as shown on the drawings, 10/27/60.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2721 | 1515-29th St., NW<br>Mrs H. T. Curtiss | Build covered entry on front; build storage room in rear. |

ACTION: Recommended for parts visible from a public highway, 10/27/60.